

REMARKS

The examiner objects to claim 6 because of informalities.

The application includes claims 1-3 and 5-17 prior to entering this amendment.

The examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-6 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art (APA) (Fig. 1, pages 1-2 of the specification) in view of Cappels, Sr. (U.S. Patnt 5,731,838).

The examiner rejects claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the APA (Fig. 1, pages 1-2 of the specification) in view of Cappels and further in view of Ichiraku (U.S. Patent 6,097,379).

The applicant amends claim 1 to include some of the limitations of claim 11. The applicant also amends claims 5 and 6 to correct certain informalities.

The application remains with claims 1-3 and 5-17 after this amendment.

The applicant adds no new matter and request reconsideration.

Claim Objections

The applicants correct informalities in claim 6 according to the examiner's suggestion.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

The examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-6 and 11-17 as obvious over the APA in view of Cappels. The applicant amends claim 1 to include some of the limitations of claim 11.

Claim 1 recites an *edge detector circuit* to generate an *edge pulse signal*. The examiner alleges that the ADC 130 of the APA discloses the claimed edge detector circuit. However, as described in the specification, the ADC 130 of the prior art converts the analog image data 132 into *digital image data* 134. This is in contrast with the recited *edge detector circuit* which generates an *edge pulse signal*. Put differently, the ADC 130 has a function different from the edge detector circuit of claim 1.

Claim 1 also recites a *phase detector circuit* to generate a phase adjust signal responsive to a *phase of the phase locked loop clock* and the edge pulse signal. The examiner alleges that the digital data analysis circuit 140 of the APA discloses the claimed phase detector circuit to generate a phase adjustment signal responsive to a phase of the phase locked loop clock and the edge pulse signal. The digital data analysis circuit 140, however, generates a phase adjust signal responsive to a *digital data* outputted by an ADC 130. This in contrast with the claimed phase

detector circuit, which generates a phase adjust signal responsive to a phase of the *phase locked loop clock*.

Amended claim 1 also recites that the *phase adjust circuit* generates a *plurality* of delayed clock signals by delaying the *phase locked loop clock*. This limitation was previously included in claim 11. While rejecting claim 11, the examiner alleged that Cappels discloses the limitation in his phase adjuster 50, which produces *an* adjusted pixel sampling clock 64 that matches the phase of the video signal 52. Thus, the phase adjuster 50 generates a *single* adjusted pixel sampling clock 64, which is in contrast with the recited *plurality* of delayed clock signal generated by the phase adjust circuit.

Moreover, Cappels' phase adjuster 50 works in response to a signal from the μ PROC 48 and a non-adjusted pixel sampling clock signal 66. This is in contrast with the recited phase adjust circuit, which generates the delayed clock signals by delaying the *phase locked loop clock*.

Additionally, it seems that the examiner believes that it would have been obvious to combine the phase adjuster 50 of Cappels with the applicant's APA, on which the rejection of claim 1 is mainly based. But the motivation to combine is not present in either Cappels or the APA as it must. The examiner appears to have improperly used hindsight from the present application to construct motivation to combine the references.

Even if motivation to combine was present (it is not), the combination of Cappels' phase adjuster 50 with the APA would not produce an operable system. This is because the APA circuit does not use any delayed clock signals obtained by delaying the phase locked loop clock.

Thus, at least for the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance, along with associated dependent claims 2-3, 5-6 and 11-17.

The examiner rejects claims 7-10 as being old over the APA in view of Cappels and further in view of Ichiraku.

The rejection is based on same incorrect interpretation of the APA in view of Cappels as we discuss above. Claims 7-10 are, therefore, likewise in condition for allowance.


Conclusion

The applicants request reconsideration and expeditious issuance of all remaining claims. The applicants encourage the examiner to call the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Graciela G. Cowger
Registration No. 42,444

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613